LINGUISTIC MANIPULATION: DEFINITION AND TYPES

Dr. Akopova Asya, Department of the English Language of the Humanitarian Faculties,
South Federal University, Russia, Rostov-on-Don
E-mail: rsu-akopova@yandex.ru

UDK: 81'23

Abstract: The article touches upon basic aspects of the theory of speech acts that is defined as influence exercised upon a human being or a group of people through speech and related non-verbal means by the speaker in order to achieve definite aims, i.e. to change the listener's behavior, his mental set, intentions, perceptions, evaluations, etc. in the course of verbal interaction.

Keywords: theory of speech manipulation, intentional manipulation, non-intentional manipulation, communication, legal linguistics.

Manipulation is linguistic term with great creative potential that is first and foremost topical in the framework of the theory of linguistic manipulation. The wide and somewhat blurred semantic filed of the term "manipulation" includes such key elements as "negative" intention of the speaker and covert (not evident for the listener) character of influence. Manipulative functions of discourse create covert, masked layer of linguistic data that is not easily separated from purely informational content. Depending on the character of utterance (its orientation towards past or future), more importance is attached to either confirmation with objective reality (if the topic of interaction touches upon something that has already happened) or to the pragmatic factor (frankness of the speaker whose speech is associated with the future).

Language mechanisms operating the processes of speech manipulation have appeared spontaneously, as the language itself to a certain degree facilitates distortion of objective reality offering not only specific designations, but also imprecise, blurred, ambiguous denominations. Manipulative discourse takes position between two extreme points – the legitimate (true, full) information and a lie. A lie and manipulation are opposed to different types of truth: a lie stands up against "semantic truth"; manipulation opposes "pragmatic truth".

Manipulation is realized when the listener cannot see the speaker's covered intentions behind what is actually being said. As one of the key parameters of manipulative utterance is specific intentionality, in order to discriminate manipulation, one has to analyze such parameters as aim of verbal communication, communicative intention, reason, and motive. Manipulation is pragmatic aspect that achieves its goals without evident detection of communicative intention: the speaker wittingly chooses such form of utterance that lacks direct signals of his intentional condition. By increasing the level of inadequate perception of information field, manipulation widens illusionary subjective reality. Manipulation is negative social psychological phenomenon exercising destructive effect upon an individual and the society as a whole.

Verbal manipulation can be stretched in time presenting both a complex, multistage, phase-by-phase procedure (as in case of informational propaganda and project promotion companies), or it can be a singular, relatively simple act of influencing the recipient in the course of interpersonal communication. Vicarious character of manipulation preconditions guidance by such linguistic units and categories as foreign (lacking inner form) words, euphemisms, figures of speech of different content and composition. At that, proper linguistic characteristics of distinctiveness of manipulative discourse are difficult to identify, as generally they do not trespass the framework of regular speech practice. Active usage of manipulative discourse of certain grammatical forms and syntactic constructions does not create specific "ma-

nipulative grammar", as the same linguistic means are used to fulfill other functions. At the same time, consideration of linguistic means typical for manipulative texts is important for identification of the fact of manipulation. A discourse becomes manipulative not due to usage of specific lexical or grammatical units, but, first and foremost, through association with the speaker's intentions, unclear influential character of the utterance, conditions of communication (social context). Language offers to speakers a whole arsenal of means to realize manipulative aims. Linguistic manipulation is marked by language signs of different levels that help interpret the speaker's intentions.

Manipulative influence refers to problems of linguistic legal framework. Estimation of legal force of linguistic phenomena, which is the object of a new complex discipline called legal linguistics, has to be extended to the concept of manipulation. Until recently methods of manipulation (in political discourse, advertisements or horoscopes published in the media) help avoid exposure and appliance of legal sanctions. Legal settlement of conflicts is hindered due to unexploited and unsystematic character of manipulative side of the language, absence of specialized vocabulary that would describe manipulative techniques, as well as legal mechanisms, that would take into account both spontaneous patterns of a natural language and the system of legal regulations. Similar to diagnosis of direct lie opposed to ontological truth, one can diagnose manipulation opposing epistemological truth. As semantic destruction as a method of manipulation impairs participants of election campaign, and unprincipled advertisement harms product consumers, this can and should become subject of legal linguistics.

Lexicographic genre, being a special means of linguistic understanding of language phenomena, is able to accumulate such concept as manipulation. A dictionary of manipulative techniques should contain distribution analysis of the name "manipu-lation", description of concepts actualized through manipulation strategies and a list of manipulative techniques with thorough presentation of split-level language means of their realization.

Supposedly, exclusion of manipulative component from modern political practices will facilitate assertion of truly democratic political culture. Collaborating, dialogical and liberal communication centered around absolute revelation of intentions and arguments, can become antipode of manipulative influence. In the conditions of democratization of society, mechanisms of manipulative influence carried out by the media should be made clear and transparent through elaboration of criteria that could be used to discriminate corresponding suggestive techniques.

Linguistic manipulation in a broad sense is any verbal interaction regarded from the point of view of its motivation and realized by the subject (speaker) and the object (listener) of communication. A subject of communication regulates behavior of his interlocutor through speech, stimulating him to commence, alter or accomplish an action whenever the need arises. The speaker can either stimulate proper responsive verbal or non-verbal action, or exercise indirect influence in order to mould certain emotions and perceptions required by the speaker. In the long run, these perceptions are supposed to organize such behavior on the part of the listener that the speaker was aiming for. By exercising influence upon a person, we aspire to mould his behavior to suit our needs.

Oral presentation of information is an important aspect of linguistic influence. In case of a written text it is easier for the reader to discern inserted influence, as a text is always as hand and can be revised and contemplated. This is impossible when dealing with oral information. In order to grasp the meaning of every word in the context and think while listening to a sequence of oral messages, one need time which is often deficient. Thus, if separate words are intentionally stressed and if

speech is structured with a definite aim, oral information can exert greater influence than written text.

Summing up what has been said, we can conclude that linguistic manipulation is influence exercised by one person upon another or a group of people through speech and non-verbal means oriented toward achieving a certain goal that consists in changing of the addressee's behavior, perceptions and intentions in the course of communicative interaction.

Manipulation of consciousness and behavior presupposes existence of a subject and an object of manipulation, influence upon the listener's motivation sphere. These and other factors create foundation for basic classification types of linguistic manipulation highlighted in linguistic literature and works in the field of psychology.

Depending on the sphere of mental activity participating and dominating in the process of communication, linguistic manipulation is divided into rational and emotional. In his attempts to influence interlocutor's behavior, the speaker can affect his rational sphere. To do this he uses convincing facts and arguments impacting people's consciousness. The aim of emotional manipulation is expression of the speaker's emotions and acquisition of responsive emotional reaction from the listener that would lead to changes in his behavior. There are two types of emotional manipulation: indirect (i.e. realized through original appeal towards the rational side of the listener) and indirect (i.e. realized through creation of figurativeness, various fault in logical thinking.

According to the character of subject-object interaction, manipulation can be direct (i.e. the subject is openly presenting his demands to the object of manipulation) an indirect (i.e. manipulation directed at the environment rather than at the object). Direct method of linguistic manipulation includes such forms of the language system that are associated with certain meaning directly expressing corresponding illocution, i.e. communicative aim of the speaker. Thus, for example, declarative and interrogative utterances are conditionally connected with illocutionary forces of a message. Indirect method of expression of communicative intention presupposes usage of language forms to express illocution force not connected with their direct linguistic meaning. Indirect forms do not openly express the speaker's intentions.

According to awareness of linguistic actions, manipulation can be *intentional* and *non-intentional.* In case of intentional linguistic manipulation, the subject aims at a definite result on the part of the object of manipulation. Non-intentional linguistic manipulation is exercised involuntary, as the subject does not aim at achieving results from the listener.

According to the type of linguistic action, manipulation can be:

– *social* (social non-informational speech acts with clichés in the form of greetings, oaths, prayers);

– *volitional* (speech acts of following the speaker's will in the form of orders, requests, refusals, advise, etc.);

– *informational and estimative* (speech acts setting public moral, legal, interpersonal emotional relations in the form of reprobation, praise, accusation, insult, threat).

Perlocutionary criterion (addressee's reaction) presents basis for discrimination of the following types of linguistic manipulation:

– *evaluative* (changing of the subject-object relation, connotative meaning of the object for the subject);

– *emotional* (formation of general emotional mood);

– *rational* (reconstruction of categorical structure of individual conscience, introduction of new categories).

According to orientation towards the interlocutor, manipulation can be *person-oriented* and *society-oriented*.

Person-oriented linguistic manipulation is directed towards the listener by the speaker who constructs the image of his interlocutor in order to achieve the desired

effect.

In case of society-oriented manipulation, the speaker doesn't construct the image of a separate listener, but creates generalized image of a group as a whole.

Every type of linguistic manipulation can facilitate regulation of interlocutor's activity and change his behavior.

The process of construction of the theory of linguistic manipulation presupposes differentiation of manipulative and actualizing manipulation, on the one hand, and productive and non-productive manipulation, on the other hand. Such differentiation of manipulation means in the framework of communication takes the form of hierarchy reflecting various levels of communicative skill in language usage. Non-productive manipulation is presented as the bottom of hierarchy, while speech actualization is situated at the top.

In psychology the term "manipulation" is defined as type of psychological affection, which in case of skillful realization leads to implicit provocation of another person's intentions that do not correspond to his actual wishes and his stimulation towards commitment of actions required by the manipulator.

Linguistic manipulation is based upon mechanisms that compel the listener to perceive verbal messages uncritically and facilitate creation of illusions and misperceptions impacting addressee's emotions and making him accomplish actions advantageous for the speaker.

Non-productive form of manipulative affection is associated with the desire to covertly influence the interlocutor's consciousness in order to frustrate him, i.e. impart psychological discomfort. In other words, non-productive manipulation is linguistic action aimed at manifestation of supremacy over the interlocutor through demonstration of his imperfection, inferiority, which leads to submission to the speaker's demands.

The aim of productive manipulation is to win communicative partner and manipulate his behavior through exploitation of his weaknesses. In this case, initiator of communication becomes a voluntary donor who positions his interlocutor in the situation of social welfare, status superiority. The easiest means of manipulation are compliment and flattery.

Both productive and non-productive manipulation of addressee's behavior presupposes influence upon his emotional sphere as opposed to other forms of reinforcement of volition appealing to the rational sphere.

The highest form of linguistic interaction and manipulation is communication on cooperative actualizing level that is the optimal alternative of effective communication. The basic behavioral parameter of the agent of actualization is respect of interlocutor's individuality, principal equality and openness of manipulation techniques. Actualizing communication is based upon desire to arise the listener's sympathy.

It should be noted that mastering of actualizing communication is not an easy task. Thus, in everyday life manipulative forms are predominant.

REFERENCES

Dotsenko E. (1997). Psychology of Manipulation: Phenomena, Mechanisms and Protection. *Chero Publishing*. Moscow.

Issers O. (2002). Communicative Strategies and Tactics of the Russian Speech. *URSS Editorial Press*. Moscow.

Leontyev A. (1981). Psychological Peculiarities of a Lecturer. *Knowledge Press*. Moscow.

Pocheptsov G. (1987). Communicative Aspects of Semantics. *High School Publishing*. Kiev.

Slobin D., Greene J. (1976). Psycholinguistics. *Progress Publishing*. Moscow.

Tarasov E. (1990). Linguistic Manipulation: Methodology and Theory, *Optimization of linguistic manipulation*. Moscow University Press. Moscow.

Thomas J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction. An Introduction to Pragmatics. *Pearson Education*. London.

Zhura V. (2000). Emotional Deixis in Verbal Behavior of an English-speaking Individual. *Volgograd University Press*. Volgograd.